Case 1:12-cr-00876-VSB Document 189 Filed 06/13/17 Page 1 of 11 1

H5Q7CEGC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 12 Cr. 876 (VSB) V. 5 PAUL CEGLIA, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 New York, N.Y. 8 May 26, 2017 11:00 a.m. 9 Before: 10 11 HON. VERNON S. BRODERICK District Judge 12 13 APPEARANCES (via telephone) 14 PAUL ARGENTIERI, ESQ. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

(In chambers)

MR. ARGENTIERI: My name for the record is Paul Argentieri. Presently I'm at my dad's home in Hornell, New York, 215 Main Street. I do have a house out in California too, but presently I'm in Hornell, New York, where my office is located.

THE COURT: This is Judge Broderick. I see on the top of your letterhead that that's your location of your office.

MR. ARGENTIERI: Yes. I have been in Hornell since 1979, continuously practiced, because of this case maybe not a lot since that time.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Argentieri, I've read your letter and reviewed the exhibits attached to it. I think the main issue is, as you acknowledge in your letter, you are no longer Mr. Ceglia's attorney; is that correct?

MR. ARGENTIERI: Well, no, I'm not his defense attorney. I'm not admitted into the Southern District. I am only admitted in Buffalo and Syracuse, but for all practical purposes I really never practiced in federal court. But, no, I'm attorney of record in the civil case for sure, yes. And I had an injunction, that's true too.

THE COURT: Yes. So, in connection with this case, since you don't represent Mr. Ceglia -- and, quite frankly the

other issue is that since he is currently a fugitive and the case is in essence on hold, you know, I -- and I'm not exactly sure -- well, let me ask you this: What specifically were you seeking from your application?

MR. ARGENTIERI: Well, my application, if I understand the process in the criminal case, I believe — and from reading the transcripts — you want attorneys to write a letter to you, make a written application first. In order for you to provide permission to go on the record, it's my understanding in the federal court system you have to file everything electronically.

Well, because of the protective orders — and I'm not literally a defense attorney, except that the federal prosecutors and the Gibson Dunn lawyers said I'm a fact witness in the case, which is true. I thought the only practical way to communicate what I have would be to send you a letter in camera in chambers, because I don't want to violate any order or be accused of violating any order, or having any attempt to have me arrested for violating any order.

So having done that, what I would like to do is move forward with a formal am application on the record, and I can submit all what I've submitted presently what you're reading or have read in a formal application on the record if I have your permission, and see what the responses are.

THE COURT: OK. All right. So I think what makes

sense at this stage -- you know, it's not entirely clear to me, Mr. Argentieri, that necessarily you have standing in connection with this to file, but I will -- and we can take care of having your letter and the exhibits filed on the docket.

MR. ARGENTIERI: OK.

THE COURT: And in connection with that, I will issue a -- you know, again I'm not sure -- you know, the standing issue is one thing. I will ask whether the government and Mr. Ceglia's criminal attorney, whether they want to solicit a response -- you know, submit anything in connection with this before I make a ruling. And then if I get any papers from them, you know, after that, I will make a ruling.

MR. ARGENTIERI: All right. I think that's more than fair. Yeah, Gil Messina -- and, for the record, I had a lawsuit in California for defamation. Gil is also my attorney in that case.

THE COURT: I am aware that Mr. Messina -- because in part Mr. Messina I think filed a notice of appearance in the criminal matter, and there was an issue that came up with regard to whether or not -- and I think it was even in connection with you mentioned that the government indicated that you would be a fact witness. In fact, I think that occurred shortly before Mr. Ceglia fled prosecution, I think. The government had submitted something on that.

resolved.

But in connection with that, you know, there was an issue -- and I don't remember necessarily whether it was resolved -- it may have been -- you know, about the possibility of a conflict, and I don't think it was a hundred percent

So, yeah, I'm aware that Mr. Messina represents you.

I wasn't aware that it was in connection -- if I was aware, I

forgot -- in relation to a defamation suit in California.

MR. ARGENTIERI: He was also my defense attorney when I was sued in New York City with Judge Rakower. So he is my defense counsel there. Simultaneously he is my wife's pro hac vice attorney in California.

But I think that's meritorious -- I guess I'm not used to your practice. So I understand, you're going to allow me to formally file in the court system a record what I submitted to you and then communicate with Mr. Messina and/or -- well, Mr. Fogg and the federal prosecutors.

THE COURT: Well, actually what I propose is something slightly different, which is that I, myself and my staff, would take care of having the letter filed on the docket as well as the exhibits. We would issue an order indicating that we received the letter in camera and that we decided to file it and solicit any comments from the government and from the defense related to the contents of your letter.

I suspect -- and I haven't thought this through -- but

I suspect that I will probably get some filing from the folks at Gibson Dunn. And then once that is done, I will make a ruling.

So, I don't think you need to do anything. By anything, I just mean we'll take care of getting it filled, and we will take care of notifying the parties that they have an opportunity, should they choose to, to respond.

I mean it's a little tricky from -- well, I mean I will leave it to the defense attorneys, but it's a little tricky for the defense attorneys because they don't have a client with whom they can consult about this, so they may not have too much of a reaction one way or the other. But I think, you know, on balance, rather than me ruling without their input, I will give the parties an opportunity to have their input.

MR. ARGENTIERI: Judge Broderick, would that be a public record then when it is filed?

THE COURT: It will be, yes.

MR. ARGENTIERI: OK. And the second question is is it possible, if they want to, the criminal defense lawyers to join in the application? Or is that something --

THE COURT: Well, I mean I will leave that up to them, you know, based upon whatever they think their obligations are to Mr. Ceglia.

The other thing I should say is, obviously, since the

letter is going to be filed on the public docket, this conference is also something that -- although it's not clear that the transcript necessarily will be on the docket, but it will be something that's publicly available.

MR. ARGENTIERI: That's fine with me. I mean if there is any other questions you want to ask me, I'm probably the only attorney that can recite pretty much chapter and verse what has gone on for the past seven years. I didn't know if you have any other questions for me.

THE COURT: I do not. Well, the one question, since you mentioned Mr. Messina, and since you are represented in some other matters by Mr. Messina, is about the defamation case. Is that an active case right now?

MR. ARGENTIERI: No, it happened -- I guess two days ago the Supreme Court of California denied -- the SLAPP motion was granted. We appealed. The appellate division there denied us, and now the Supreme Court of California denied us, and now I think that case is dead.

And New York City, with the malicious prosecution case, for the record, no judgment of dismissal of the complaint has been formally filed, so that case technically is open. But just to be clear, I mean all of these cases are the same case that originated that I started in Belmont, New York in 2010.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ARGENTIERI: I really appreciate the fact that --

I guess you read my letter and my contents.

THE COURT: And just to be clear, I'm not obviously opining one way or the other with regard to the substance of the letter.

MR. ARGENTIERI: No, I understand.

THE COURT: Obviously I will give the parties an opportunity to submit whatever they want to submit, if anything. Then once I see that, I will make a decision. I don't believe -- well, I will make a decision about whether I want to have any kind of oral argument, but if I decide not to have oral argument, I will just issue an order from that after I get their papers. OK?

MR. ARGENTIERI: If I could ask a question. Is it ever possible -- you see, in New York when we practice in New York, we call hearings when you actually take testimony, so in order to get that, you would have to order that after the papers rather than making a decision on the papers.

THE COURT: Well, in other words, if I think I need additional information, in particular that I need testimony with regard to the matter, I could ask for a hearing. I could schedule oral argument where I would take a proffer from the attorneys of what the factual testimony might be. So, there are a number of options. And again I'm not saying one way or the other what I'm going to decide, but, yeah, if I felt there was a need for an evidentiary record, you know, I could

schedule a hearing or direct the parties to submit affidavits.

MR. ARGENTIERI: Yeah, the best evidence in this case has been kept in real-time back in 2003 and 2004 in these e-mails. So, with all due respect to these other attorneys, rather than writing these briefs and affidavits, it's amazing to me we can't read the literal evidence in real time.

But having said that, I appreciate you calling me and having the conference matter. And I'm on the record, and I told the prosecutors that if I didn't have to give up attorney/client privilege, they could interview me all they wanted. Maybe I will have an opportunity now. I don't know. So thank you very much.

THE COURT: OK. Well, obviously in connection with the privilege, you know, Mr. Ceglia would have to waive the privilege.

MR. ARGENTIERI: That's correct.

THE COURT: But --

MR. ARGENTIERI: I will state this on the record that's not waiving attorney/client privilege. There is no attorney who has ever interviewed Paul Ceglia, or any expert we ever hired that ever indicated he was a fraud or anything of that nature, so that I can state on the record.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. ARGENTIERI: Well, thank you, Judge, and thank you to your staff. I appreciate it.

1 THE COURT: All right. So we will take care of --MR. ARGENTIERI: Do you think that will be filed 2 3 today, do you think? 4 THE COURT: Well, it depends. The letter certainly is 5 short enough that we could get it on the docket. The real 6 issue is going to be getting the exhibits and putting them on 7 the docket. We will have to see. We have PDFs that you sent to us. It depends if they're in the right format. So we're 8 9 going to try and get it on the docket. I think it might not be 10 until next week, but it might hit the docket today. 11 MR. ARGENTIERI: OK. I quess one last question. 12 this point in time do I have to wait for the letter to be 13 published to talk to Mr. Messina or Mr. Fogg? 14 THE COURT: The answer is -- since Mr. Messina 15 represents you arguably at least in the New York case -- and I know the California case seems as if it's dead -- I mean you 16 can speak to them as you see fit. 17 18 MR. ARGENTIERI: OK. 19 THE COURT: They may -- I mean they may want to wait 20 until they see all of the paperwork. 21 MR. ARGENTIERI: Sure. 22 THE COURT: But, yeah, no, I'm not precluding you from 23 speaking with them. 24 MR. ARGENTIERI: OK.

THE COURT: If you choose to do so.

25

MR. ARGENTIERI: Yeah. And I don't think I sent the 1 2 exhibits in PDF form; I just sent a hard copy. 3 THE COURT: OK. So, we will have to make PDFs of that, so that will take time, so it won't hit the docket until 4 5 next week. 6 MR. ARGENTIERI: All right. But the letter will be 7 hopefully filed today. Well, thank you very much, Judge. I 8 appreciate it. 9 THE COURT: Well, the letter may not be filed, because 10 we would want to file the letter at the same time we file the 11 exhibits. 12 MR. ARGENTIERI: Sure. OK. Well, I appreciate you 13 calling, and I think this is going to be very interesting from 14 here on out. 15 THE COURT: OK. All right. Thank you very much. 16 MR. ARGENTIERI: Thank you, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Take care. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25